REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-33 remain pending, all of which stand rejected.

1. Finality of Office Action

Claims 1-33 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0054688 to Tran in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087679 to Pulley et al. (hereinafter "Pulley"). Claims 1, 3-10, 12-15, 17-24 and 26-33 are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Tran alone.

Applicant believes the rejection of claims 1, 3-10, 12-15, 17-24 and 26-33 over Tran alone is a "new rejection" that 1) was not necessitated by any amendment made by applicant, and 2) was not based on any information submitted in an IDS.

Applicant therefore requests a withdrawal of the finality of the 8/16/2007 Office Action.

2. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-10, 12-15, 17-24 and 26-33 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-15, 17-24 and 26-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0054688 to Tran.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Tran teaches a method for tracking issues, wherein a log-in page is provided to log-in a user, in paragraph [0028]. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Tran's paragraph [0028] states, in part:

> In accordance with one embodiment of the invention, the user/customer 14 uses a GUI to create and submit an issue report. For example, when a user /customer 14 has a problem with a component, he/she starts the program which may display a issue report screen. FIG. 4 schematically illustrates an example of a display screen 30 for submitting an issue report. As shown in FIG. 4, the display screen 30 may include a space for inputting the reporter's identification (a

user name, user ID, email address, or the like) 32. . ... The reported date and other information may be automatically stamped to the issue report.. . .

Nothing in Tran's above disclosure teaches, suggests or pertains to presentation of a "log-in page" or user log-in. Rather, Tran teaches that a user "starts the program" and is presented an "issue report screen" (and not a log-in page). Although the user may input their identification information as part of "submitting an issue report", the user's identification information is only "stamped to the issue report". Tran does not indicate that the issue report screen is equivalent to a "log-in page", or that the identification information input to the issue report screen is in any way used for "log-in" purposes.

Also with respect to claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Tran teaches a method for tracking issues, wherein a user is provided an interface page having "a configuration corresponding to a predetermined access level of the user, in paragraph [0033]. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Tran's paragraph [0033] states, in part:

> Referring back to FIG. 2, the authorized user 18 is typically an administrator of the tracking system 10, and has a privileged access to the system 10. The authorized user 18 is not only permitted to download the component list from the database, but also modify the component list and upload the modified component list back to the database. Such a privileged access may require a specific authorization such as a password.. . .

Nothing in the above excerpt teaches or suggests providing "an interface page" having "a configuration corresponding to a predetermined access level of the [authorized user 18]". And, in contrast to applicant's claim 1, wherein 1) a user is provided a "log-in page", 2) user information is received via the log-in page, and 3) the user is provided an interface page that "has a configuration corresponding to a predetermined access level of the user", Tran does not indicate that A) a user becomes "authorized" by logging in, or B) a user is associated with a "predetermined access level". Rather, Tran appears to disclose a system where 1) log-in is not required, 2) a user is not associated with a predetermined access level, and 3) a user must supply a password to access a component list.

Further with respect to claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Tran teaches a method for tracking issues, wherein the method comprises providing an embedded uniform resource locator of [an] issue record", in paragraphs [0026] and [0027]. More specifically, the Examiner asserts:

> . . .Tran suggests providing an embedded URL of an issue record (page 2 paragraph [0026] and [0027]). Here, the user/customer submits an issue report, via email or other means, to the administrator (responsible entity) therefore, it is suggested that an embedded URL would be in the email. Tran further suggests an embedded URL when in paragraph [0026] when the tracking system sends the user/customer back an email notification in response to being processed, that this would be an embedded URL.. . .

8/16/2007 Final Office Action, p. 8.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. To begin, applicant notes that Tran does not once mention a URL or an "embedded URL". Furthermore, sending an email to a responsible entity when an issue or problem is reported (opened) (Tran, par. [0026]) is not equivalent to "providing an embedded URL of [an] issue record". Although the Examiner speculates that an email alerting a responsible entity of an issue may comprise an embedded URL of an issue record, applicant believes this speculative interpretation of Tran's teachings is being driven by applicant's own teachings and the benefit of hindsight reconstruction. Applicant refers the Examiner to paragraphs [0031]-[0032] of Tran's teachings, which state:

> [0031] . . .The tracking system 10 may also notify the responsible entity 16 when an issue report is received, so that the responsible entity can access the system database to retrieve the issue report and perform necessary action.
> [0032] The responsible entity 16 is a person (or a group) who solves the issue and fixes the problem. **The responsible entity 16 typically accesses the database containing the issue reports, opens an issue to be solved, performs necessary actions, and then reports the results to the system 10.**. . .

(Emphasis added).

Of note, Tran does not indicate that the responsible entity 16 receives an email and then clicks on or otherwise selects a URL embedded in the email to open the issue.

Rather, Tran indicates that the responsible entity 16, receives an email, accesses the database containing issue reports, *and then opens an issue to be solved*. Applicant believes this suggests to (if not teaches) one of ordinary skill in the art that the email received by the responsible entity 16 does not contain an "embedded URL of the issue record". Thus, Tran's method does not contain a step of "providing an embedded uniform resource locator of the issue record", as recited in applicant's claim 1.

Claim 1 is believed to be allowable for at least the above reasons. Claims 3-10 and 12-14 are believed to be allowable, at least, because they ultimately depend from claim 1. Claims 15, 17-24 and 26-33 are believed to be allowable, at least, for reasons similar to why claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

3. Rejection of Claims 2, 11, 16 and 25 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 2, 11, 16 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0054688 to Tran in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087679 to Pulley et al. (hereinafter "Pulley").

Claims 2, 11, 16 and 25 are believed to be allowable, at least, because 1) they ultimately depend from claim 1 or 15, 2) claims 1 and 15 are believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth in section 2 of these Remarks/Arguments, and 3) Pulley fails to teach that which is missing from Tran, as discussed in section 2 of these Remarks/Arguments.

4. Conclusion

In light of the above Remarks/Arguments, applicant respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLAND & HART, LLP

By: _____

Gregory W. Osterloth
Registration No. 36,232
(303) 295-8205